

REMARKS

Claims 11-14, 16, and 18-27 are now pending in the application. Claims 15 and 17 were previously canceled. New Claims 23-26 include the same limitations of Claims 14, 16, 18 and 19, respectively, having only their dependency changed to allowed Claim 22. Because the subject matter of Claims 23-26 have been previously fully searched, these claims are submitted to be in allowable form. New Claim 27 includes similar limitations to allowed Claim 13 and its base claims. Because the subject matter of Claim 27 has been previously fully searched, Claim 27 is submitted to be in allowable form. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and enter the new Claims in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The Examiner noted the amendment filed June 30, 2003 indicated that corrected drawings were attached, but the submittal contained only formal drawings and not corrected drawings. Applicant is herein resubmitting the sheets provided with the amendment filed 6-30-03, with the following clarifications. The sheets provided herein are labeled "Replacement Sheets". Replacement Sheets 1/9 to 6/9, 8/9 and 9/9 are formal drawings showing Figures 1-11 and 13-14, respectively, which Applicants respectfully request be substituted for the originally filed sheets 1/9 to 6/9, 8/9 and 9/9, respectively. Sheet 7/9 includes figures 12A, 12B and 12C. Figures 12A, 12B and 12C have been converted to formal drawings and specific dimensions have been deleted as follows. In figure 12A, the dimensions --3.0"-- and --2.0"-- and the dimension reference lines for these dimensions have been deleted. In figure 12B, the dimensions --4.0"-- and --3.0" MAX-- and

the dimension reference lines for these dimensions have been deleted. In figure 12C, the dimension --2.5" MAX"-- and the dimension reference line for this dimension have been deleted. An Annotated Sheet 7/9 is provided for information and has been marked in red to show deletions made to the originally filed Sheet 7/9.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to substitute Replacement Sheets 1/9 to 9/9, provided herewith, for the originally filed sheets 1/9 to 9/9.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11, 12, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berry et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,311,302). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of anticipation in rejecting Claim 11. The Examiner's suggestion that Berry et al. meets the limitation "a mechanism slidably connecting the housing to a structure of the seat" is submitted to fail the requirement that each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. A rotating member (the pivotable swing arm 92 of Berry) or a member rotating about an arc (pivotable swing arm 92 rotates in an arc described by arrow 93 in Figure 6 of Berry) inherently requires a pivot point or pivot pin for an end of pivotable swing arm 92 opposite to the "end" supporting movable housing 90. See column 7, lines 13-16. It is submitted that rotation of pivotable swing arm 92 about a

pinned or fixed point is not expressly or inherently equivalent to the limitation of a member which is slidably connected.

Claim 11 is therefore submitted to be in allowable form. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claim 11. Because Claims 12, 14 and 16 depend either directly or indirectly from Claim 11, Claims 12, 14 and 16 are considered to be in allowable form. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claims 12, 14 and 16.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,311,302) in view of Williams, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,038,426). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Berry et al. discloses a video terminal 80 having a movable housing 90 rotatably joined to a fixed housing 82 which is subsequently detachably mounted to an armrest console 84 of a passenger seat. See column 7, lines 3-16. "Movable housing 90 is supported at the end of a pivotable swing arm 92". See column 7, lines 13-14.

Williams, Jr. discloses a receiver 300, acting as a housing fixedly supported to structural elements of a seat 210 (see Figure 5), and a line replaceable SEU 310 joined to receiver 300 with a fastener 365 operably having first and second latch elements. See column 4, lines 23-29. In another embodiment, Williams, Jr. teaches attaching the line replaceable SEU 310 to a track mechanism on one side and sliding the SEU 310 to a position where it is locked in position. See column 4, lines 33-39. By using fastener

365, or locking the SEU 310 in position, Williams teaches away from a sliding connection of a housing to a structure of a seat.

Neither Berry or Williams, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a housing slidably connected to a structure of a seat. The suggested modification of Berry and Williams cannot render Claim 11 or Claim 20 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claims 11 and 20. Because Claim 18 depends directly from Claim 11, the suggested modification of Berry and Williams cannot render Claim 18 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of Claim 18.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claim 22 is allowed. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indication of allowed subject matter.


The Examiner states that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants previously added Claim 22 including the limitations of claim 13, the base claim and any intervening claims. Because Claim 11 is herein submitted to be in allowable form, and Claim 13 depends indirectly from Claim 11, Claim 13 has not been herein amended.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 10, 2003

By: 
Thomas J. Krul
Reg. No. 46,842

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/TJK/cg